Project Goals

► Maximize public safety.

► Provide a long term plan to optimize organizational efficiencies.

► Ensure a financially achievable and sustainable plan for city facilities.

Today’s Agenda

► Review Phases 1-3 process

► Check in on Phase 4
Process

ANALYTIC STEPS

PHASE ONE
What are the facilities needs?
- Identify current use
- Estimate current space needs
- Project future space needs

PHASE TWO
How suitable are our current facilities?
- Inventory existing facilities
- Assess suitability for use
- Assess condition

PHASE THREE
What’s the best plan for Tukwila?
- Identify alternatives (buy, build, lease)
- Assess alternatives
- Identify the preferred approach

PHASE FOUR
How do we get there?
- Phasing and Funding Plan

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT & OUTREACH

- Steering Committee
- Website
- Media Coverage
- Council Worksession

- Steering Committee
- Website updates
- Media Coverage
- Council Worksession

- Steering Committee
- Web Video
- Media Coverage
- Community Presentations and Discussions
- Council Worksession

- Steering Committee
- Website updates
- Media Coverage
- Council Worksession
- Plan description
- TukTV
A conservative estimate of future needs:
Tukwila Population and Employment Projections

- Residents
- Employment
- Actual Trend
- PSRC Forecast
- Historical-based Forecast

- 49,979 Employees in the year 2040
- 24,452 Residents in the year 2040
A growing population, aging facilities

Tukwila Population Change Over Time, 1910 - 2010

- Fire Station #54: Built 1961
- George Long Shop: Built 1965
- Fire Station #51: Built 1971
- City Hall: Built 1977
- Fire Station #52: Built 1971
- 6300 Building: Built 1978
- Minkler Shops: Built 1972
- Community Center: Built 1995

Population:
- 1910: 361
- 1920: 453
- 1930: 424
- 1940: 521
- 1950: 800
- 1960: 1,804
- 1970: 3,509
- 1980: 3,578
- 1990: 11,874
- 2000: 17,181
- 2010: 19,107
## Phase 2

### Square Footage Reconciliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>2013 Needs</th>
<th>2040 Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Essential Government Services</strong></td>
<td>144,044</td>
<td>205,237</td>
<td>235,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire, Police, Finance, Mayor’s Office Council, Courts, City Clerk, DCD, HR, IT, Public Works, City Attorney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Supporting Facilities</strong></td>
<td>88,248</td>
<td>88,248</td>
<td>88,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural and Community Centers, Park Restrooms and Shelters, Golf Course Associated Structures, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>232,292</td>
<td>293,485</td>
<td>323,815</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRITERIA IN EVALUATING ALTERNATIVES:

- Public Safety
- Customer Service
- Efficient Delivery of City Services
- Development Cost
- On-going Operating Expenses
- Location
- Flexibility
## Facility Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Property Marketability</th>
<th>Property Attributes</th>
<th>Public &amp; Staff Experience</th>
<th>Facility Specifics</th>
<th>Evaluation Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Hall (1977)</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6300 Building (1978)</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center (1995)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Golf Maintenance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minkler Building (1972)</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Long Shops Building (1965)</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station 51 (1973)</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station 52 (1971)</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station 53 (1995)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station 54 (1961)</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Purpose
As part of the needs assessment, we have assessed the suitability and condition of these City facilities. This assessment will help determine the City's plan for each of the facilities such as remodeling, selling, repurposing, or redeveloping.

### Key
- Suitable Condition
- Unsuitable Condition

---
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Recommendations – City Hall Campus

► Function of City Hall remains on the current site
► Current City Hall be retained and renovated (if feasible and cost effective)
► Police & Courts be relocated to a new Public Safety Building
► Police & Courts be located elsewhere than current site
► Dispose of the 6300 Building after utilizing it as ‘interim’ space while building a new Public Safety Building and renovating the current City Hall.
**Recommendations – City Hall Services**

- Retain Current 24,000 sf City Hall Building
- Construct addition(s) over time to City Hall to eventually accommodate:
  - DCD 9,000 sf
  - Finance 3,900 sf
  - Human Resources 1,300 sf
  - Information Technology 2,600 sf
  - Mayor’s Office 5,500 sf
  - City Council 4,400 sf
  - Public Works Admin 7,100 sf
  - Parks & Rec Admin 8,700 sf
  - **Total:** 42,500 sf
Recommendations – Public Safety Building

► New Public Safety Building to house:
  - Courts 5,000 sf
  - Police 33,100 sf
  - Emergency Operations Center 6,000 sf

► Location Considerations (Phase 4):
  - Centrally located
  - Highly visible to community
  - Commercially zoned property
  - Relatively flat site, and 4 to 5 acres in size
  - Convenient access to a major arterial
  - Outside flood plains and soils subject to liquefaction
Conclusions – Public Works

► Minkler and George Long Shops should both be replaced
  ▪ Both are currently located in floodplains
  ▪ Both are currently located on soil subject to liquefaction
  ▪ Both are significantly undersized for today’s needs
  ▪ Both facilities have significant deferred maintenance issues

► Minkler and George Long Shops should be co-located
  ▪ Co-locating affords higher efficiency
  ▪ Co-locating is likely less expensive to build
  ▪ Co-locating is likely less expensive to maintain
Recommendations – Public Works

► Seek property for a new consolidated Public Works Campus that would accommodate all of the City services currently located at the Minkler and George Long shops.

► Ideally, the new subject property would have the following characteristics:
  - Size of 8 to 10 acres of ‘usable’ land area
  - Outside any floodplains and floodways
  - Outside areas of liquefaction soils
  - ‘Industrial’ zoning designation
  - Efficient access to all areas of the City
Recommendations – Fire

► Fire Station 53
  ▪ Retain in current location
  ▪ Minor improvements

► Fire Station 54
  ▪ Replace/Relocate – Northwesterly
  ▪ Investigate partnership with City of Seatac

► Fire Station 52
  ▪ Replace/Relocate – Southeasterly
  ▪ Administrative Headquarters

► Fire Station 51
  ▪ Replace/Relocate – South 180th St

No further analysis of fire facility needs pending the outcome of the Regional Fire Authority Annexation investigation.
Objective:

Development of a preferred Funding and Phasing Strategy that balances timing, impacts on capital resources, public safety, and customer service, among other considerations.

Phase 4 includes:

► Development of a Phasing Plan
► Fiscal Context Setting
► Review of Funding and Finance Options
Cost Estimates

What will these projects cost?

$2015 dollars

► New Public Safety Building: $25 million
► New Public Works Campus: $26 million
► Full Renovation & Additions to City Hall: $18 million
  ▪ Alternate – Interim Remodel to City Hall: $7 million
  ▪ Alternate – Extend the life of the 6300 Building: $7 million
► Long-range Future Projects:
  ▪ Police Precinct or Public Safety Bldg Addition: $4 million
  ▪ Addition to Public Works Center: $3 million
Construction Phases

You are here!

Needs Assessment & Feasibility Study
- Identify current and future space needs
- Assess suitability of existing facilities
- Identify preferred alternatives
- Phasing and funding plan

Budget, Siting, & Design
- Adopt Capital Improvement Plan
- Public engagement and outreach
- Property search and acquisition
- Design

Build
- Construction
- Move-in

Facility needs are met!
Sequencing Considerations:

- Acquire land while available
- Construction in an occupied building
- Creating capacity, i.e., musical chairs
**Public Safety & City Hall**

**OPTION A**

**PUBLIC SAFETY FACILITIES**

Public Safety Building
- 2019 Move-in

Police Precinct
- 2034 Move-in

**CITY HALL**

City Hall Campus
- 2021 Move-in

**OPTION B**

**PUBLIC SAFETY FACILITIES**

Public Safety Building
- 2020 Move-in

Police Precinct
- 2035 Move-in

**CITY HALL**

Renovation & Reconfigure
- 6300 Improvements

Seismic Upgrades

City Hall Expansion
- 2040 Move-in

- Total Cost: $32.3 M

|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
**Public Works**

**OPTION A**

**PUBLIC WORKS**

City Shops Facility  
*2019 Move-in*

Facility Addition  
*2039 Move-in*

$29.4M

**OPTION B**

**PUBLIC WORKS**

City Shops Facility  
*2022 Move-in*

Facility Addition  
*2037 Move-in*

$29.4M

($2015)
## Phasing Option A

### Public Safety Facilities
- **Public Safety Building**
  - 2019 Move-in
- **Police Precinct**
  - 2034 Move-in

### Public Works
- **City Shops Facility**
  - 2019 Move-in
- **Facility Addition**
  - 2039 Move-in

### City Hall
- **City Hall Campus**
  - 2021 Move-in

### Community Supporting Facilities
- **Facility Improvements and Upgrades**
  - Estimating $1M every other biennium

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>$29.8M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>$29.4M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>$18.1M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>$6.0M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$83.3M ($2015)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phasing Option B

PUBLIC SAFETY FACILITIES

Public Safety Building
- 2020 Move-in

Police Precinct
- 2035 Move-in

PUBLIC WORKS

City Shops Facility
- 2022 Move-in

Facility Addition
- 2037 Move-in

CITY HALL

Renovation & Reconfigure
- 6300 Improvements

Seismic Upgrades

City Hall Expansion
- 2040 Move-in

COMMUNITY SUPPORTING FACILITIES

Facility Improvements and Upgrades
- Estimating $1M every other biennium

Total Costs:
- $29.9 M (Public Safety Building)
- $29.4 M (City Shops Facility)
- $32.3 M (City Hall Expansion)
- $6.0 M (Facility Improvements and Upgrades)

Total Estimated Cost: $97.5 M (2015)
Phasing Options

PHASING OPTION A

Pros:

► City’s most pressing public safety issues addressed sooner as opposed to later
► Further investments in the 6300 Building would be minimized
► Minimizes future inflation risks by completing projects sooner

Cons:

► Requires more financial resources in the short-term as compared to Option B
► Higher project management and construction oversight needs due to rapid implementation

PHASING OPTION B

Pros:

► Spreading the costs over a longer period to minimize near-term funding impacts on the CIP
► Maintains a focus on public safety elements while deferring other parts of the Facilities Plan.

Cons:

► Requires significant investment in 6300 Building to extend it’s useful life
► Requires a larger overall financial commitment than Option A
► Spreading more work into the future will be subject to construction cost inflation risks
Fiscal Context

How can the City of Tukwila meet its facility needs?

► No magical bag of money!
► Must balance facility investments against other capital needs.
### Tukwila’s Capital Improvement Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Expenditures</th>
<th>2015-2020 6-Year Total</th>
<th>6-Year Percent of Total</th>
<th>Beyond 6 Years</th>
<th>Beyond 6 Years Percent of Total</th>
<th>Total Identified Cost</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Streets</td>
<td>$4.19</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$5.20</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>$9.39</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges &amp; Arterial Streets</td>
<td>$32.50</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>$97.04</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>$129.54</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>$2.40</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>$22.77</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>$25.17</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>$34.50</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$36.75</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Improvements</td>
<td>$1.20</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>$0.20</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$1.40</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Improvements</td>
<td>-$1.40</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>$16.34</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>$14.94</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>$41.15</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$176.04</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$217.19</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
<th>2015-2020 6-Year Total</th>
<th>6-Year Percent of Total</th>
<th>Beyond 6 Years</th>
<th>Beyond 6 Years Percent of Total</th>
<th>Total Identified Cost</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Operating Revenue</td>
<td>$10.32</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>$103.27</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>$113.59</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>$15.30</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>$12.25</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>$27.54</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Fees</td>
<td>$0.88</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$14.81</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>$15.70</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans/Bonds</td>
<td>$7.85</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>$44.77</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>$52.62</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation</td>
<td>$0.28</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0.28</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVFT</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$6.53</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>$0.94</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>$7.47</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Tax</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REET</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funding</strong></td>
<td><strong>$41.15</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$176.04</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$217.19</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Funding Considerations:

► Existing needs and priorities
  ▪ How do city facilities fit within the broader needs of the City?

► Available resources
  ▪ What current resources may be leveraged for facilities?

► Current debt load and remaining debt capacity
  ▪ What capacity does the City have to carry additional debt?
  ▪ What will the impact of additional debt be on the annual operating budget?
  ▪ To what degree will the City be restrained from meeting other capital needs?

► New revenue opportunities
  ▪ Transportation Benefit District to increase overall CIP funding
  ▪ Voted-bond for one or more of the new facilities
  ▪ Use, Repurpose or sell City surplus properties
How do we determine affordable phasing?

► Utility enterprise funds can pay for 50% of public works facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>($2015)</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Cost net 50% of Public Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option A</td>
<td>$83.3 M</td>
<td>$68.6 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option B</td>
<td>$97.5 M</td>
<td>$83.8 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

► Phasing calls for large sums in short time windows, as a result the City can’t pay-as-you-go. Costs are too BIG!

► Use debt for large outlays:

**POTENTIAL BOND SEQUENCE**

(year of estimates)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Option B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$4.73 M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$4.87 M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$15.97 M</td>
<td>$5.79 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$16.45 M</td>
<td>$5.93 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$10.05 M</td>
<td>$10.95 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$10.35 M</td>
<td>$11.27 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6.33 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6.52 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2039</td>
<td></td>
<td>$19.01 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td></td>
<td>$19.58 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impact on CIP

PHASING OPTION A

- Cash
- New Facilities Debt Service
- Existing Debt Service

PHASING OPTION B

- High CIP Allocation
- Low-Medium CIP Allocation
- % of Low-Medium CIP Allocation

+$53 M
Impact on CIP (new $)

PHASING OPTION A

- Cash
- New Facilities Debt Service
- Existing Debt Service

High CIP Allocation

Low-Medium CIP Allocation

% of Low-Medium CIP Allocation

PHASING OPTION A-1, $25.5M voted bond for Public Safety

High CIP Allocation

Low-Medium CIP Allocation

% of Low-Medium CIP Allocation
PHASING OPTION A

Impact on CIP (new $)

Cash
New Facilities Debt Service
Existing Debt Service

High CIP Allocation
Low-Medium CIP Allocation
% of Low-Medium CIP Allocation

High CIP Allocation
Low-Medium CIP Allocation
% of Low-Medium CIP Allocation

PHASING OPTION A-2,
.02% Sales and Use Tax levied via a TBD

2015 2017 2019 2021 2023 2025 2027 2029 2031 2033 2035 2037 2039
Next Steps

- Based on Council feedback, create *Option C* and a roadmap for implementing Tukwila’s Facilities Plan
- Compile final plan, with supporting funding and finance options
- Develop final report
- Create an easy-to-read overview of the Plan for general audiences